

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated October 18, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims. Claims 16-24, 41, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, 57-73, 76 and 77 were rejected, and claims 3, 8, 13, 27-29 and 56 were allowed. While Applicants do not acquiesce in the rejections, to expedite prosecution the rejected claims have been canceled, and new claims 78-93 are being presented herein.

Claim 78 recites the steps of determining the number of items that are contained in respective file system objects, assigning relative display sizes to icons that are based upon the number of items contained in the file system objects they represent, and displaying the icons at their respective assigned display sizes. As a result of this method, the relative display size for an icon is representative of the number of items contained in the file system object that it represents.

It is respectfully submitted that this claimed subject matter is not suggested by the Sciammerella patent. This patent discloses that images are displayed at different sizes in accordance with their *temporal* relationship, e.g. when they were created. It does not relate to icons representing objects that function as containers for other objects. As such, it does not contain any disclosure suggesting that the relative display sizes of a plurality of icons should reflect the number of objects in the respective containers they represent.

The Office Action refers to the screen shots of Microsoft Windows NT as disclosing that icons are displayed in accordance with the number of files in an object. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the screen shots do not disclose such a concept. In Microsoft Windows, when the "Arrange Icons by Size" option is

selected, the individual *files* in the window are sorted according to size. However, *folders* are not sorted in the same way.¹ Rather, they are sorted in alphabetical order. That is why the folder labeled “ACTION61” appears before the folder labeled “FP61”. This ordering has nothing to do with the number of objects contained in the respective folders.² Thus, neither of the references discloses the concept of displaying container objects with reference to the number of items contained in them. Consequently, any possible combination of their teachings would not lead to the subject matter recited in claim 78.

Claim 80 recites that the relative display size of an icon is assigned in accordance with the amount of memory required to store the object it represents. Although Microsoft Windows provides the ability to arrange file icons by size, that option only relates to the *order* in which the icons are displayed, for example in a list. It does not affect the *relative size* at which the icon is displayed. Rather, all of the icons are displayed at a common size.

Furthermore, there would be no reason to adjust the sizes of the icons in such an arrangement. If the file icons are listed in order of size, the user has all of the information needed to determine the relative sizes of the files, from largest to smallest. There is nothing further to be gained by adjusting the sizes of the icons.

New claims 81-83 are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 78-80, respectively. In addition, these claims recite the steps of selecting a subset of icons, assigning relative display sizes to the selected icons in accordance with the number of items in a container or the amount of memory

¹ In Microsoft Windows, folders do not have a “size” associated with them. This can be seen by selecting the “Details” option under the “View” menu command.

² To confirm this, if the Examiner changes the name of the folder “ACTION61” to a name that begins with any letter subsequent to the letter “F” in the alphabet and then selects the “Arrange Icons by Size” option, the folder “FP61” will appear first in the list, even if it has no files in it.

required to store an object, displaying the selected icons at the assigned sizes, and displaying the non-selected icons at a default size. It is respectfully submitted that the cited references do not disclose these additional features recited in claims 81-83.

For at least these same reasons, claims 84-93 are submitted to be patentably distinct from the cited references.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, PC

Date: April 18, 2006
By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620